

To: Members of the Amherst Select Board

RE: ISSUANCE OF A NEW LIQUOR LICENSE IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

I am writing on behalf of my wife and myself to express our grave concern about the proposed issuance of a liquor license to the convenience store on Triangle Street near the corner of South Pleasant. We wish to raise a number of issues.

First and foremost, we cannot understand at all why the Board would even **consider** the application, given the existence of a similar store, already with a full liquor license-Cousin's-less than 300 yards away.

Indeed, the experience of the activity around Cousins, where police are often to be found, suggests that an undesirable situation is likely to develop on and around Triangle Street. A major issue in this instance is the street carries a great deal of traffic, raising the possibility that unruly pedestrians may be struck by passing cars, since, unlike Cousins, the location under consideration is not buffered by a large parking lot. If anything, the proposed new rotary will only aggravate the issue of traffic safety.

Second, since the store was sold as a going concern we assume that the current business model is adequate to ensure the operation is viable. In fact the presence of the new luxury rental property directly opposite will increase foot traffic and hence income. Thus there is no need for the mooted license.

Third, we on Cottage Street already experience on an ongoing basis minor vandalism and littering with empty beer bottles, wrappers etc. We believe that this problem will be aggravated further by the existence of a more proximate source of similar material. Why should we have to act as garbage collectors?

Fourth, the confluence of Amherst High School students with those from UMass will raise the temptation on both sides to engage in illegal activity, namely purchase of liquor for underage persons.

Fifth, the argument the new owner makes that he has an exemplary track record at his two existing locations holds no water in the context of the current application. He is comparing apples to gooseberries. His current stores are embedded in relative low density communities and, more important, are not near educational institutions. In sharp contrast, we live in an area with much passing foot traffic and notably large numbers of students, notorious for unruly behavior; providing them with an additional source of liquor can only aggravate the situation and, again, we are likely victims.

Finally and more personally, we walk our dog regularly along Triangle Street, passing the store under scrutiny, and have concerns about our safety in the event of a granted license, for many of the reasons listed above. We are **local residents**, paying high property taxes for the convenience of living in a great location; we should not be forced to consider changing our behavior to enrich a non-resident businessman.

As you will know from correspondence in your hands and the comments to be raised next Monday night by leaders of the local community, the residents of Cottage Street are firmly against the proposed action. We suggest that the board has an obligation to listen to us and to support our concerns by denying the application and we will object strenuously to the alternative outcome.

Paddy
ELAINE

Paddy and Elaine Ross